

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10368	
Project Title	Environmentally sound destruction of PCBs in Brazil	
Date of Screening	30-Nov-19	
STAP member Screener	Jamidu Katima	
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design
		<p>The project intends to destroy 15,000 MT of materials containing PCBs. It is expected to have three outcomes: strengthened institutions relevant to PCB emissions, environmentally sound disposal of PCBs, and monitoring and reporting system.</p> <p>STAP suggests that the following issues be addressed as the project is further developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In Paragraph 19, it is expected that an agreement will be signed with enforcement authorities to enhance the promotion of related obligations. This is expected to be achieved "by presentations in all possible public environment and industry events..." It is, however, difficult to understand how "presentations in all possible public environment and industry events" will lead to the signing of an agreement. The series of interventions that are expected to lead to the signing of the agreement needs to be further detailed in the proposal. •The IEO's terminal evaluation study of projects under the chemicals and waste focal area revealed that there is little evidence that GEF's chemicals and waste projects have been successful in putting in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms to scale up achieved results or to ensure continued engagement of private sector actors (http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf). In the proposal, the financial mechanism to sustain the project is only mentioned, without elaboration. The information presented in Paragraph 24 to 26 on the intended business model does not adequately present the business model or financial mechanism that will be deployed. With this lack of details, there is a danger of this project replicating the same problem identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be given to the business model for financing the activities to achieve GEBs beyond the lifetime of GEF funding. Although not specific to PCB decontamination, ideas on financing models can be gleaned from the Norwegian Institute for Water Research report on "financing model of contaminated soils" (https://www.iisd.org/sites/default/files/publications/green-finance-soil-remediation-international.pdf).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Paragraph 30 seems to suggest that the achievement of the promised GEBs from this project is dependent on a budget. It will be useful to clarify the implication of the available budget to achieving the expected GEBs from this project. •Scaling up and replication is vital to the durability of project outputs. The proposal states that implementing pilot projects and business models will facilitate scaling up. Beyond this, no further information was provided on how this will be achieved. Overall, the section on innovation, sustainability, and scaling-up do not provide a convincing argument on how the project will achieve these elements of a GEF project. There is a need to provide more clarity on this. STAP recommends that the project proponents refer to relevant publications on scaling-up, such as the nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy (https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scalingup_strategy_who_2010.pdf); thinking systematically about scaling up (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/335807-1338987609349/ARD13_DP_Scaling_Up_web.pdf); and scaling up in development cooperation - practical guidelines (https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GI2-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf). •Risk: Each risk needs to be rated as either low, medium or high. More risk factors need to be considered, including environmental, technical, economic, financial, socio-cultural, etc. •Climate risk: the proposal does not consider the potential risk of climate change on the project's outcomes. How would projected climate change affect the proposed methodology for cleaning and disposal of PCBs? What are the associated risks, and what mitigating factors will be put in place? Detailed analysis of climate risk and management strategy needs to be presented.
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Yes
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes. The barriers are described, no threat has been mentioned. Data on PCB has been provided. No data for the other interventions
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Not adequately presented

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	For multiple focal area projects: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Improved enforcement through institutional strengthening; Implementation several pilot projects; creation of a platform for knowledge sharing and exchange Yes, however the underlying assumption are not presented
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Innovation aspects need more elaboration. The financing mechanisms is mentioned without elaborating what this would look like Scaling up is envisaged through replication but how that will be done is not clear
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes, however owners of PCB Facilities and the roles are missing

	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Need improvement. Please see STAP overall assessment above for further comments
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	Not provided. Climate risk and management strategy need to be provided
	· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?	
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed	
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.	

	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."</i></p>	
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>	
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>	
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	